

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  
DONN P. PICKETT (SBN 72257)  
FRANK M. HINMAN (SBN 157402)  
KRYSTAL N. BOWEN (SBN 163972)  
SUJAL J. SHAH (SBN 215230)  
SUSAN J. WELCH (SBN 262320)  
FRANK BUSCH (SBN 258288)  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067  
Telephone: 415.393.2000  
Facsimile: 415.393.2286  
donn.pickett@bingham.com  
frank.hinman@bingham.com  
krystal.bowen@bingham.com  
sujal.shah@bingham.com  
susan.welch@bingham.com  
frank.busch@bingham.com

Attorneys for Defendant  
Intel Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

ALL ACTIONS

Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK

**DECLARATION OF JOY C. SHERROD  
REGARDING INTEL'S PRODUCTION OF  
COMPENSATION RELATED DISCOVERY  
MATERIALS**

Date Consolidated Amended Compl. Filed:  
September 13, 2011

1 I, Joy C. Sherrod, declare:

2 1. I am a member of the Bar of the State of California and the discovery counsel at  
3 Intel Corporation assigned to this matter. Pursuant to the Court's April 15, 2013 Order  
4 Regarding April 12, 2013 Joint Discovery Status Report to the Court, I submit this declaration  
5 regarding Intel's production of compensation related discovery materials. I have personal  
6 knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration, except those matters stated on information  
7 and belief, which I believe to be true, and, if called to testify as a witness, could and would do so  
8 competently.

9 2. I am informed and believe that Intel performed a reasonable and diligent search  
10 and produced the compensation materials for each year in the discovery period responsive to  
11 plaintiffs' Requests for Production of Documents ("RFPs"), including Request No. 20 (seeking  
12 documents concerning methods used for determining employee compensation), subject to Intel's  
13 objections and responses to plaintiffs' RFPs, and the subsequent related agreements made by the  
14 parties during the meet and confer process, as outlined below.

15 3. The parties modified plaintiffs' RFPs in the meet and confer process and  
16 subsequent correspondence between the parties. The parties agreed that Intel would search for,  
17 review and produce documents pursuant to two "tracks." For the first track ("Track One"), Intel  
18 would interview employees to identify the location of centralized files with potentially  
19 responsive, "high-level documents" without the need to run search terms against electronically  
20 stored information (ESI), as well as specific documents (e.g., contracts, organization charts,  
21 handbooks) responsive to plaintiffs' RFPs. For Track Two, the parties agreed that Intel would  
22 collect ESI from custodians and apply agreed-upon search terms to the ESI to locate potentially  
23 responsive documents for review and production.

24 4. Pursuant to Track One, Intel interviewed individuals in Intel's Compensation &  
25 Benefits Group, the organization within Human Resources responsible for analyzing  
26 compensation and developing recommendations related to compensation decisions, and for  
27 developing policies related to compensation. These individuals helped identify shared file sites  
28 ("Sharepoint sites") with potentially relevant documents as well as specific documents related to

1 compensation that were responsive to plaintiffs' RFPs. As agreed, Intel did not run search terms  
2 against the ESI in the Sharepoint sites. Instead, Intel collected all the documents in the identified  
3 Sharepoint sites (nearly 70,000) and reviewed all for responsiveness and privilege. After this  
4 collection and review, Intel produced the non-privileged documents responsive to plaintiffs'  
5 RFPs -- e.g., policies; manuals; high-level analyses, reports, studies, and summaries -- that fell  
6 between the date range of January 1, 2001 -- January 1, 2012.

7 5. Pursuant to the agreed-upon Track Two process, Intel collected ESI from 20  
8 custodians. Intel next applied the agreed-upon search terms to this ESI to identify potentially  
9 relevant documents. These search terms included a number of terms related to compensation  
10 policies, practices, and analyses. As agreed to by the parties, Intel reviewed those documents  
11 revealed by the search terms and produced the non-privileged responsive documents that fell  
12 between January 1, 2004 and December 31, 2010, and (for a subset of agreed-upon custodians)  
13 January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2011.

14 6. Intel also separately produced data responsive to plaintiffs' RFPs. During the  
15 meet and confer process on plaintiffs' RFPs, plaintiffs provided Intel with a data "wish list."  
16 Intel discussed plaintiffs' "wish list," as it related to compensation data, with employees in the  
17 Compensation & Benefits Group. Those employees identified databases and data fields that  
18 were potentially responsive to plaintiffs' "wish list," as well as data plaintiffs requested that Intel  
19 did not maintain. Intel produced data from the databases and data fields that it identified as  
20 being potentially responsive to plaintiffs' "wish list."

21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the  
22 foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Santa Clara, California, on April 25, 2013.

23  
24  
25   
26 Joy C. Sherrod  
27  
28